



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,792	10/18/2001	Guillaume Royer	S1022/8246	9624

23628 7590 11/03/2003

WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC  
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA  
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE  
BOSTON, MA 02210-2211

EXAMINER

LI, UYEN CHAUN

ART UNIT

2876

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/831,792

Applicant(s)

ROYER, GUILLAUME

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

-- **Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Prelim. Amdt/Amendment***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed 11 August 2003.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orihara et al (US 5,705,852) in view of Houdeau et al (US 6,191,951).

Re claims 1-6 and 8, Orihara et al discloses an electronic circuit including a planar base 1, an antenna 2 attached on a first surface on the base 1; and a chip 6 connected to the antenna 2 by connection wires 9 (figs. 5A & 5B), or by connecting bumps [6a, 6b] and connecting terminals [2a, 2b] followed by heating, which serves a welding beads; characterized in that a double faced adhesive 5 is glued on one of the base surfaces; and wherein the base 1 is formed of polyester film, which is flexible (fig. 1b; col. 3, lines 45+).

Orihara fails to teach or fairly suggest that the chip being arranged at least partially in a slot made in the double faced adhesive, and the chip and the wires being covered with a drop of resin.

Houdeau et al teaches in fig. 3 a semiconductor chip 11 in the package 7 is disposed into a recess, which serves as an opening, of an adhesive 9 (col. 4, lines 28-50).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Houdeau et al into the teachings of Orihara et al in order to provide Orihara et al with a better protection of the chip/IC module from the outside environment. Furthermore, such modification would provide Orihara et al with a more feasible system due to the shortening of the length of the chip connecting wires. Accordingly, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Orihara et al, and therefore an obvious expedient.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orihara et al as modified by Houdeau et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hara et al (US 4,727,246). The teachings of Orihara et al as modified by Houdeau et al have been discussed above.

Re claim 7, Orihara et al/Houdeau et al disclosed the chip 6 connected to the antenna 2 by, but fails to teach or fairly suggest the surface of the base, which does not receive the double faced adhesive is provided to receive printing of a pattern of a text or of a code.

Hara et al teaches the surface of the base, which does not receive the double faced adhesive, is provided to receive printing of a pattern of a code 41 (figs. 6 & 12; col. 8, lines 40+).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hara et al into the teachings of Orihara et al/Houdeau et al in order to provide Orihara et al/Houdeau et al with a more secure system wherein each card has its unique identification code (e.g., a holder code, etc.). Furthermore, such

modification would have been an obvious engineer design variations for aesthetic and security purposes, in which the card appearance is covered with pattern of a text, such as the holder's name and the service name, etc., thus the name of the card's holder can be recognized readily just by looking its cover, preventing fraudulent use in the event of lost/stolen/misplaced.

5. Claims 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orihara et al as modified by Houdeau et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Murohara (US 6,089,461). The teachings of Orihara et al as modified by Houdeau et al have been discussed above.

Re claims 9-22, Orihara et al/Houdeau et al has been discussed above and further discloses the chip 11 in package 7 is spaced from and does not contact the double faced adhesive 9 (see fig. 3).

Orihara et al/Houdeau et al fails to teach or fairly suggest that at least a portion of the antenna is disposed in the opening and the thickness of the double faced adhesive is greater than or equal to the height of the electronic chip or the resin.

Murohara teaches a portion of an antenna 2 is disposed in the opening, which is filled with resin agent 4 and the thickness of adhesive agent 14 is greater than the height of the electronic chip 3 or the resin 4 (figs. 4-6; col. 4, lines 17-63).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Murohara into the teachings of Orihara et al/Houdeau et al in order to improve the strength against bending and enhance the protection capability of the chip and/or antenna in the event the card is bended.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Newly cited reference to Houdeau et al (US 6,191,951) was used to further meet the limitation of the claimed invention.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Hara, Kazuya (US 4797542 A); Haghiri-Tehrani et al. (JP 01036496 A); Brignet et al. (US 5030309 A); Kubota et al. (US 5763868 A); Zafrany et al. (US 6435414 B1); Haghiri-Tehrani et al. (US 4617216 A) are cited as of interest and illustrate a similar structure to a self-adhesive electronic circuit.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-5588. The examiner can normally be reached on SUN, M, W, F 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

  
Uyen-Chau N. Le  
October 6, 2003

  
KARL D. FRECH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER